

## REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 11 and 26 have been amended. Claims 1-26 are pending and under consideration.

The rejections based on Watanabe and Nakajima are overcome by the present amendments. Regarding independent claim 1, this claim recites the penetration formed by penetrating through a portion of the lower case facing the protrusion. In contrast, the receiving space 10a of the chassis 10 of Watanabe is not formed by penetrating the chassis 10. With respect to Nakajima, the spindle motor 7 and the optical pickup 10 are mounted on the base chassis 5, which is fixed to the support member 2 by screws 18. The support member 2 is combined with the loading base 1. The base chassis 5 is not slidably installed in the loading base 1, but is fixed to the loading base 1. Thus, this reference does not teach that the deck slides into and out of the lower case. Thus, the alleged penetration in the loading base 1 does not correspond to the claimed penetration.

Independent claim 11 is similarly patentable over the cited references.

With respect to claim 26, this claim recites a deck which slides in and out of the lower case comprising a protrusion occupying a volume of protruding space in which a spindle motor and an optical pickup are directly mounted without space between the spindle motor and the deck, a sliding limit of the protrusion corresponding to an edge of the penetration.

In contrast, Nakajima illustrates spacers between the supporting member 2 and the base chassis 5 that supports the motor. Thus, the supporting member 2 cannot be relied upon as corresponding to the claimed deck. It is noted that the chassis 5 does not have a substantially same shape as the space in the frame 1 that corresponds to the supporting member 2.

With respect to Watanabe, this reference also does not teach the penetration having a same shape as the protruding space. Instead, the limits of the lower extending portion of the tray 2 cannot be determined from Fig. 4 (relied upon by the Examiner). Only the lower portion at the edge shown in Fig. 4 can be determined. Thus, no portion protruding from other portions is shown.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.


Serial No. 10/643,867

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 7-30-07

By:   
Michael J. Badagliacca  
Registration No. 39,099

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501